

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 currently remain in the application. Claims 2, 6 and 14 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. No claim is herein amended.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Nakagawa in view of Bennett. These references were discussed in previously filed Amendment "F". The Examiner states in the first sentence in Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter that applicant's arguments in said Amendment "F" were not persuasive. Applicant's effort to persuade the Examiner continues in this paper and starts with a criticism on the Examiner's argument in Paragraph 2 of the Official Letter.

Nakagawa does disclose a memory device which stores packaging conditions and allows a user to input the kind of articles to be packaged. In other words, there is a one-to-one correspondence between one kind of articles inputted by the user and a set of packaging conditions corresponding to that one kind of articles. The Examiner concludes from this that Nakagawa is showing "the correlation data" (lines 12-14 of Paragraph 2). It is somewhat questionable whether or not a one-to-one correspondence, as in the case of Nakagawa, may be referred to as correlation data; it is a matter of semantics. Even if we allow Nakagawa's one-to-one correspondence relationship to be called correlation data, however, the Examiner is talking here about the correlation (or one-to-one correspondence) between the article type and the packaging data. This should be compared to what is being said in claim 1, and the Examiner will realize that claim 1 is talking about the correlation between print data and packaging conditions. In other words, claim 1 and the Examiner are talking about correlation (or correspondence) between different kinds of data. According to the present invention, packaging conditions and print data are correlated for different kinds of articles such that if a change is made in packaging conditions, for example, the print data for operating the printer would be automatically changed accordingly. The kind of "correlation" talked about by the Examiner is between the kind of articles and the packaging conditions and hence cannot accomplish the kind of automatic change described above. This simple example should be sufficient to convince the Examiner that Nakagawa does not disclose the kind of correlation which is one of the inventive elements of claim 1.

Next, the Examiner correctly observes that it was already known to incorporate a packaging machine and a printer (lines 14-17), but the Examiner concludes too hastily and erroneously without valid foundations that Nakagawa would incorporate Bennett's print data memory corresponding to the packaging conditions to print out the desired printing (page 3, lines 1-3). At the time of the invention of the instant patent application, it was known to incorporate a printer in a packaging machine but it was difficult and not done to correlate packaging conditions with print data. It was probably in part because packaging machines and printers were being produced by different makers in those days. No matter what was the reason, the fact according to the best knowledge of applicant was that correlation between packaging conditions and print data was not being considered and the inventors herein are believed to be the first to consider taking and storing such correlation data. The Examiner is strenuously reminded to distinguish incorporation of a packaging machine and a printer from correlation between packaging conditions and print data. More basically, the Examiner is requested to keep in mind that correlation does not automatically follow incorporation.

In the effort to persuade the Examiner, copies of declarations by Messieurs Nakagawa and Bennett, who are the inventors in the two references cited and relied upon by the Examiner, are being submitted. The originals of these declarations will be submitted when received at the office of the undersigned attorney. These declarations are intended to show to the Examiner that it was indeed not done around the time when their inventions were made to correlate packaging conditions and printing data although a printer was being incorporated with a packaging machine and it was not obvious to them to do so. Since these declarations are being made by persons having the first-hand knowledge of what was known and what was not known or obvious, the Examiner should consider them and treat them as credible statements of how things were, uninfluenced by hindsight.

Indeed, Bennett agrees that it was known to print predetermined data selected by the user on the film (page 3, lines 3-6) but it was not done to correlate the packaging conditions and print data and further to store such correlation data in a memory.

Applicant thus repeats the same argument presented earlier that the concept of controlling the bag-making operations and the printing operations in a correlated manner and that of providing and storing correlation data for such a purpose were novel and not obvious

to ordinary persons skilled in the art. The Examiner is again requested not to rely on hindsight to conclude this or that would have been obvious. Applicant continues to be firmly of the belief that the application has been in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

June 26, 2003
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
Telephone: (510) 843-6200
Telefax: (510) 843-6203